

7th. "And he sent Peter and John, saying, go and prepare us the *passover*, that we may eat." Luke xxii, 8.

8th. "The Master says "where is the great chamber where I shall eat the *passover* with my disciples?" Luke xxii, 11.

9th. "And they made ready the *passover*." Luke xxii, 13.

10th. "And when the hour was come he sat down and the twelve Apostles with him, and he said unto them, with desire I have desired to eat this *passover* with you before I suffer." Luke xxii, 15.

It is said that, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established;" instead of two or three I have presented ten, straight forward declarations that Christ ordered the preparation of the *passover* and the result shows in almost every instance that he, and the disciples did on the same evening eat the *passover* which they by his directions had prepared. I should regard it as a superfluity to offer any more testimony and no right minded person would ask for any more for if these do not establish the fact that Christ ate the *passover* ten more witnesses would fail.

But, was it *only* the *passover* which they ate, no more and no less? To this question I must emphatically answer no. It was the *passover* and it was more, it was also the institution of the "Feast of Charity" the "Lord's Supper," Love-Feast or whichever of these gospel names you may choose. I believe it was Martin Luther who said, "No man will be a successful preacher who is not a good discriminator," and I despair of convincing any man of the correctness of my views who does not possess this faculty to the extent of enabling him to discover the duality in this memorable meal, and discriminate between the office of each part, yet I hope there are a number especially among our younger brethren who possess sufficiently the power of discrimination to see and comprehend the case. We shall notice in the first place that Christ and the Apostles were Jews up to the *same* period of time, and as to just *when* that period of time was is an important factor in the investigation of this question. I take it for granted that they were Jews up to the time that

they celebrated their last Jewish rite, and that was on the night before the crucifixion and the night before the legal time to celebrate the *passover*, the *passover* was the *passover only* up to that night. In all of its history from Egypt down to that memorable night it was only called *passover*. But on the night in question another name is attached, no reason is given as to why.

Luke calls this meal both *passover* and supper, but through some method conceived only in the mind of omniscience we know that such is the fact. Now we must conclude that the meal on that night received a dual name; it would seem that the old name mysteriously vanished and the new name sprang up and with the departure of the Jewish rite the fact of the actors being Jews also departed and they were thenceforth Christians. The meal having a dual name also designs it for a dual purpose and this was [the end of the old dispensation, and the beginning of the new; they no longer keep the *passover* but the church from this time celebrates the Lord's Supper and will do so until it receives its fulfillment in the kingdom of God.

The last *passover*, and the first supper, the one ended, and the other commenced. The old painters made a stupid blunder, when they called their production "The last Supper" they should have called it the *first* supper, or the last *passover*. Let us not forget that it *was* the last *passover* that ever was, or ever will, be properly kept. The Jews intended to keep it the next night, which was the correct time according to the law but by the time they should have killed the paschal lamb the Lamb of God had taken its place and was sacrificed on the cross the sun was darkened and the earth was in convulsions, no *passover* was kept that year by them and ever after it would be out of date, for the type was ended in Christ the anti-type and the keeping of it ever after that would be a useless ceremony. But there is yet a part of that dual meal unfulfilled and that is the supper part. Christ says in reference to this, "With desire I have desired to eat this *passover* with you before I suffer, for I say unto you I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Luke xxii, 15 16. This he

said immediately after they took their seats at the table, before they had eaten while the meal was yet in its duality. I am aware that the revised version made by a set of men who were universally educated to the belief that there should be no supper in the church but the bread and wine which they call supper, tried to so translate this passage as to destroy the dual idea in it, but in this they show their, to say the least of it, unfairness. The fact remains the dual idea is in the original, the, emphatic Diaglott, but Mr. Wilson, too, failed to grasp the supper idea in full, so he thinks the "not any more" ought to be omitted but it is in the text and that to stay. "I will not any more eat thereof," is as good a rendering as can be had. It is equivalent to saying I will not any more eat *of it* as Mr Wilson translates it.

Now then for a little fine discrimination; *it*, would mean, the whole in one, and rob us of the duality idea; "*of it*" implies parts of a whole, the whole meal was before them untouched for all I know when Christ uttered these words, and our exegesis is this: Jesus longed to see the arrival of this last *passover*; his death and dreadful sufferings had been typified by it for many long years and he greatly desired to see the end of it, when another type should spring out of it, and take its place which not like the old, should remind him of his sufferings, but should anticipate his triumphs and his glory, in his Father's kingdom, no wonder his desire was great. Now he tells them in substance that he will again eat a part of this as yet undivided *passover* or supper with his saints in the kingdom of God. What part? The old Jewish part? Oh no, this was finished and ended on this memorable night, and finally and eternally fulfilled the next day on the cross. But the new part, the Christian part, the Lord's Supper part the Feast of Charity part. It shall be fulfilled in the kingdom of God, and must be perpetuated in the church until it reaches the point of its fulfillment. Let us examine a few of the many passages that tell of this glorious time. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the